MARYGROVE COLLEGE LIBRARY

270

The Catholic Mind

Issued Twice a Month **Price 5 Cents**

How To Tell a Christian

Lingard the Historian

Volume XXXI, No. 19 **October 8, 1933**

THE AMERICA PRESS

New York, N. Y.

SOUND PHILOSOPHY

LOYAL AMERICANISM

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

$4.00	.....	*Domestic*
4.50	.....	*Canada*
5.00	.....	*Foreign*

AUTHENTIC THEOLOGY

CATHOLIC ACTION

THE CATHOLIC MIND, October 8, 1933. Volume XXXI, No. 19. Published semi-monthly by The America Press, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York. Subscription postpaid. United States, 5 cents a copy; yearly, $1.00; foreign, $1.25. Entered as second-class matter, October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 4, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rates of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

THE CATHOLIC MIND
Vol. XXXI., No. 19, October 8, 1933

How to Tell a Christian

REVEREND JOSEPH KEATING, S.J.

Reprinted from the Month *(London), September, 1933.*

CHRIST Himself selected the token by which His followers should be known. I say "His followers" for although all men are creatures of God and, on account of this common origin, akin to one another, yet only those raised to the supernatural order by grace and thus made co-heirs with Christ can be rightly styled God's children, mutually united by the tie of brotherhood. Hence it is the duty of baptized Christians to be foremost in recognizing, in thought and act, the solidarity of mankind. It was to emphasize this solidarity that the Founder of Christianity, out of all the moral perfections which He Himself taught and practised, selected the unifying virtue of love to distinguish His brethren for all time. He did not, as He might well have done, select Faith in Himself as such a mark: nor Fortitude in resisting evil, though that too is essential: nor even Obedience to His law, obvious as that might seem. No: "By this shall all men know," He emphatically decided, "that ye are My disciples, if you have love one for another." Thus He demands more than mere justice—the giving to each his due—difficult though even that is for fallen man. And He does not restrict the "one another" to friends and fellow-disciples; that would not form any distinction—"do not the heathen do this?" He calls His followers to a rôle, the exercise of which is a sure sign of their supernatural union with Himself. "Love your enemies," He commands, "do good to them that hate you, and pray for those who calumniate and persecute you." Of all His "hard sayings," none has proved more difficult to practice than this, for it runs counter to that love of self which is the deepest of human instincts. Few of His followers have followed Him perfectly herein, but the ideal has been a constant stimulus to all, and the world's history is full of heroic examples of the Christian meekness thus achieved.

The early Christians, in the first flush of their conversion

and with the example of Christ's own disciples before their eyes, were indeed conspicuous, in a world corrupted by self-love, for their overflowing charity. And, doubtless, by contrast with the surrounding heathendom, this was long their characteristic. But even the Apostles had constantly to exhort them to fresh efforts and to reproach them for vices contrary to fraternal love—the "works of the flesh," so carefully enumerated in Galatians ". . . enmity, strife, jealousy, wrath, dissensions, factions, parties, envy . . ." These tares stood amid the wheat from the first, as they stand today, when, despite nineteen centuries of Christianity, the "natural man" has re-asserted himself with such energy and success, when the world's whole outlook is a practical repudiation of the Christian law of love.

It was, doubtless, hard, when the world was at war, to uphold the Christian ideal of love. Then, in order to nerve kindly men to the barbarous work of mutual slaughter, it was thought necessary to cultivate hatred, and, in order to nourish that evil growth, to maintain a campaign of lying and calumny which stuck at no invention, however horrible. The spirit thus evoked did not return whence it came on the declaration of peace; for, alas! it presided at the Peace Conference, the terms of which were, in many respects, unjust and vindictive, destined, as all injustice is, to keep alive resentment and to provoke fresh conflicts. Fifteen years after Versailles, the victors who, scorning the Christian wisdom of the Vatican, allowed fear and revenge to dictate their policy, find themselves confronted with a worse menace than faced them in 1914, and thus unable to abandon the transient security their present armed preponderance provides. Fear and hatred, not love that casteth out fear, rule today the counsels of Europe, in spite of the manifest moral and material advantages of mutual friendship and understanding. The machinery of peace—the World League, the World Court, the many Peace Pacts—exists but does not function, because hatred is cultivated instead of goodwill, and the nation is worshiped instead of God. Many Governments—Russia, Mexico, Spain—have formally abandoned the truths of Christian revelation—the whole idea of the next world as giving its right meaning and purpose to this—whilst all have ignored it in their political practice.

International relations tend to reflect the prevalent at-

mosphere at home. A nation, the social and industrial life of which is split up into factions and classes, making war on each other with little regard for the common good, will be all the less likely to promote harmony amongst other nations. Justice and charity alike begin at home. The extreme unlikelihood of domestic peace, failing a universally accepted religious ideal and a practical recognition of the divine law and its sanctions—a condition seldom enough found in the individual and never in the community—makes, of course, the attainment of perfect world-agreement entirely Utopian. The most that can be hoped for is a growing sense of the folly and barbarity of war as a means of *settling* international disputes, and the gradual elimination of the profit-motive which does so much to keep it alive. But without practical Christianity, the pursuit of even this ideal will be long and chequered, and the prevalent secularism of Governments, the natural result of "national" churches, is the greatest obstacle to Christian peace. Where there is no vision—no sense or sight of the supernatural—the peoples perish.

However, the arm of the Lord is not shortened. The early Church faced a much more hopeless situation, yet in a comparatively short time, it Christianized society, substantially, if not completely nor permanently. It did so by the practice of Christian charity: that mark of Christianity raised it immeasurably above the other creeds and religious systems with which it was surrounded—even above the divinely-instituted but humanly-corrupted religion of the Jews. Rigidly dogmatic and intransigent in morals as it was, it appealed to all nations and classes, and united in brotherhood the Gentile and the Hebrew, the slave and the courtier. It is surely permissible to argue that only by the same means can the renewed paganism of our times be overcome and the world re-won for Christ. In so far as fraternal love becomes, in fact as well as in theory, the mark of the Christian, Christianity will regain its lost territory and conquer fresh domains.

Instead, therefore, of lamenting the de-Christianization of the world, which hinders in so many ways even its material progress, the first task of the believer is to Christianize, thoroughly, his own little cosmos, and to restore to his practice, in so far as he need, the real spirit of his Faith. It would be startling, were it not so common, to see what de-

grading compromises Catholics, under sway of political, racial or class prejudice, try to make between their religious profession and their practice. In those nations where democracy has been replaced, for a time at least, by State-Absolutism based on ruthless force, Catholics innumerable—to mention our own Faith only—have forgotten the Church's teaching on civil liberty and because of some material advantage or racial good thereby attained, have ranged themselves willingly on the side of a régime which is not in harmony with the first Christian law. Moreover—to consider countries like France and Ireland where the Government is still democratic—are not many Catholics supporting the anti-Christian "Action Française" on the one hand, and the I. R. A. on the other, in spite of the Church's ban? In these organizations, hatred of foreign nations and of fellow-citizens is sedulously fostered, and whatever good there may be in their aims, that good is often pursued by immoral means. Yet Catholics should know what Catholic teaching is in regard to the proper constitution of States, the due place of religion in civil society, and the rights and duties of citizens. Two generations ago that teaching was summarized in Pope Leo's masterly Encyclicals—"The Christian Constitution of States" (1885) and "Human Liberty" (1888)—and it is to be found embodied in the treatises of all Catholic moralists. What has followed neglect of that sound doctrine is clear. Despising religion and pursuing false ideals, secularist States have brought the world into its present condition. Writing thirty years ago, the celebrated Catholic economist, C. S. Devas, showed the results of unsound social and political science.

> These [materialistic] doctrines have been put into practice by the laws and customs of Europe, America and Australia. But in so doing the nations of the world have been recklessly tampering with the foundations of society and in their blind antagonism to religion, have injured family life, injured the respect for law, injured the harmony of classes, have turned might into right: so that in the opening years of the new century they have attained neither private happiness nor public peace, but are face to face with social discord, national rivalries, unhappy homes, spreading divorce, shrinking birth-rates and the dark shadow of anarchism.

In spite of the portentous catharsis of universal war, the world is still wasting away under the same ailments. "The

dark shadow of anarchy" has turned into substance in Russia whose Government has no basis in justice; "national rivalries" are growing more acute, tyrannies, resting on terrorism, have replaced lawful governments in many States—all because Catholics have not duly upheld and practised Christian charity—and the State, designed by God to promote the general welfare and to protect the weaker members of society, has constantly been allowed to go beyond its sphere, and to invade the inalienable domain of the individual, of the family, of the private association—above all, of the Church.

Once the secularist State has embarked on this path, the end of which is pagan Cæsarism, it cannot be checked and brought back except by the constant re-assertion of the rights thus ignored. Nor is this by any means a hopeless effort, as our own experience in England shows, since, for love of the souls of Christ's little ones, we have defeated time and again the assaults of powerful Governments on our system of religious education. The Catholic spirit, which is the chief support of authority, nevertheless abominates tyranny —the unjustifiable use of force to regulate opinion and conduct—and when that spirit comes into the open, it rallies to itself all that is noble and generous in the human heart. It stands for real freedom, for, whenever the influence of religion is withdrawn, it is the weak and the helpless that are the first to suffer—witness the monstrous projects, widely and openly advocated, of still easier divorce, the killing of the aged and incurable, the sterilization of the imbecile poor, the substitution of harlotry for motherhood, the murder of the infant in the womb. Membership of the Church is, of itself, a God-given commission to be active in combating these abominations, which are all violations of the Christian code. It is our duty, albeit often an invidious and unpleasant one: we are God's witnesses in a godless world: if we do not so confess Christ before men, we run the risk of being unacknowledged by Him in the end.

It is not easy, without a breach of the charity which we are preaching, to say more explicitly wherein the mark of the Christian, fraternal love, seems less conspicuous than it ought to be, in the Catholic world around us. But, if the Charity of Christ really impelled us as a body, is it likely that the many good works in our midst, which have for aim, directly

or indirectly, the spiritual good of our neighbor, should be, as they are, enfeebled for want of more general support? There is the Catholic Social Guild, for instance, which, for twenty-one years has been endeavoring to apply the only real remedy to our deep-rooted industrial diseases, without receiving more than a modicum of the help which it surely deserves from the educated laity; so little do they understand the implications of their Faith, so blind are they even to their own material interests. Similarly, the Catholic Truth Society, the mainspring of that "apostolate of the pamphlet" which is one main means of bringing back the Faith to England, cannot expand its admirable work as it ought for lack of Catholic zeal. Again, instead of joining the Catholic Council for International Relations, the only body amongst us formally constituted to further the Papal policy of world-peace, many with tranquil consciences decry all such endeavors as hopeless or unpatriotic, and foster, in themselves and others, those sentiments of racial conceit and antagonism which are essentially pagan. These and the many other regiments of the Church Militant have long been, and remain, mere *cadres,* awaiting their due expansion. In a word, there are multitudes of Catholics who, in spite of all these associations calling for their aid in the work of redemption, stand aloof from Catholic activities altogether and, except for a minimum of observance, show as little love for their neighbor as do those who have no share in the Talent of Faith. So hard is it in a non-Catholic civilization to resist the infection of secularism, to keep oneself unspotted from a world which is so very much with us.

Let us not shrug our shoulders and say—it has always been so. The history of the Church is, doubtless, full of neglected opportunities, to say nothing of positive scandals, wherein even the shepherds have turned into wolves and devoured their flocks. The cause of Christ has constantly been marred by the jealousies and dissensions of Christ's followers, by quarrels amongst the clergy or rivalries between religious orders. The apathy and meanness and narrowness even of the good have often made the angels weep. Even in his own day St. Paul was moved to exclaim to the Philippians—"All seek their own ends, not those of Jesus Christ"—a spirit which leads some even to oppose good works which do not minister to their own credit. All this is

very true but, so far from being a motive for discouragement, it should rather serve as a spur to endeavor. Let us remember, what the Pope has pointed out, that the forces of hatred and evil are today ordered and disciplined *as never before,* and that, therefore, we, who serve under the banner of love and goodness, should multiply our energies and perfect our organization. It is of good augury that a movement like the "Society of the Grail," lately (July) described in our pages, should have sprung into being at this juncture, so as to mobilize young Catholic womanhood to wholehearted Christ-service in the world, and thus to meet, with even more enthusiasm and greater zeal and more genuine sacrifice, the counter-attack of atheism, the only or main motive of which is hate.

With hearts really Christ-like, purified from those stains which disordered self-love engenders—jealousy, class- or party-prejudice, racial pride and pretension, personal enmities—Catholics will be better able to appraise as they ought the various political experiments which confront them in the world today, so as to determine to what degree they are worthy of support as compatible with Catholic tradition. The one test is, do such political systems harmonize with the Gospel law of love? Is the nationalism they engender such as regards the just rights of other races and nations? Is the purpose of God in creating mankind furthered or hindered by such State-policies? It is easy to decide these questions in the case of the Soviets, who explicitly reject Almighty God, the sole source of just rule over men, and therefore are essentially tyrants and usurpers. And there can obviously be no Catholic approbation or palliation of the anti-clerical Governments of Spain and Mexico, which aim more or less directly at extirpating the Catholic religion, and thus are violating their citizens' fundamental rights. Hitlerism and Fascism, on the other hand, both contain a mixture of good and evil, and both are in process of an evolution, whose term is not yet visible. Both aim at being Totalitarian States tempered by religion. To what extent does that redeem them from the sharing the nature of pagan Cæsarism, which also was religious?

It is as true of the community as of the individual—he that would save his soul must lose it. National Self-sufficiency, a perverted ideal of our time, stands condemned by

the Gospel: it is simple personal egotism writ large, a denial of the social nature of man, and of the supernatural concept embodied in Catholicity which transcends frontiers and aims at the spiritual unification of all mankind. The attitude which St. Paul described in his repeated repudiation of surface distinctions, whether of class, race, sex or status, is essentially Christian, as true today as it was in the beginning. Whenever, therefore, we find a theory or policy, the realizing of which would tend to obscure or make more difficult the God-designed unity of mankind, and especially the brotherhood of Christians, we can safely stigmatize it as contrary to the mind of Christ. This is not, of course, to deny that the division of the human race into separate nationalities is in accord with divine Providence, but, though God wills the existence of distinct States, it is no part of His purpose that they should be hostile to each other, or seek their own interests at each other's expense. For He wishes all to belong to the universal spiritual kingdom which He set up on earth at a fixed point of human history and to hold that spiritual citizenship of greater account than any individual loyalties. And, of those who are called to belong to the Church, His Apostle has said—"We have here no abiding city but seek that which is to come." Our heavenly citizenship, therefore, which really exists although its full enjoyment is only in prospect, must necessarily aim at bridging the fissures, created by differences of race and nationality, and prevent such distinctions from weakening our sense of kinship. Thus, the more absolute allegiance which all men owe to God, speaking through conscience or in revelation, sets real and necessary limits to the virtue and exercise of patriotism, and no State which acknowledges this higher extra-civic loyalty can be called pagan, however autocratic.

Now, as regards Hitlerism, this supra-national power is admitted. Already the German Bishops had condemned in unequivocal terms various items of the Nazi program which are opposed to Christian teaching. That condemnation they have never withdrawn, nor does the recently-signed Concordat with the Holy See, which recognizes the essential rights of the Church, in any way imply that German Catholics are committed unreservedly to the full program of Hitlerism. Some perhaps, beguiled by resurgent nationalism, see nothing wrong in it, just as some Catholic Frenchmen

belong to the "Action Française," but no true Catholic can compromise on principles. We can be sure that the great Pontiff who secured the rights of the Church under Fascism and, in that all-important particular, succeeded in shattering the theory of the Totalitarian State as applied to Italy, has achieved no less in regard to the new Hitler régime which, as originally promulgated, was, in many points, incompatible with Christian faith and morality. The Church, which, on February 11, 1929, saved Italy from Cæsarism, has done the same for Germany by the Concordat of July 22. By that instrument, she has forbidden the German hierarchy and clergy to take part in any political activity—a wise prohibition considering the civic ferment in Germany, and one which, as far as mere partisan politics are concerned, might well be made universal. But, by the Concordat, the educational rights of Catholics, ecclesiastical and lay, are more fully provided for and safe-guarded than under any previous régime, which would seem to imply that the dogmas of Christian morality, an essential part of education, may be freely inculcated, both negatively and positively. Nevertheless, in a State that pushes national exclusiveness to such unwarrantable degrees as does the new Reich—which has assumed complete governmental control of the Protestant sects—the lot of the members of a supra-national Church, proclaiming love of all men as a fundamental tenet, is likely to be difficult and dangerous. All Catholics, for instance, must condemn the brutal invasion of personal integrity involved in the compulsory sterilization law which the German Cabinet approved on July 25, and the whole unfounded conception of Germany as a pure and superior race, exhibited already in an indiscriminate outlawry of "non-Aryans," is bound to issue in a series of similar enactments, which will create a severe testing time for German Catholics.

The law of love under which we live does not preclude, but rather inspires, unceasing war against immorality and injustice of every kind. It is no part of charity to condone sin out of regard for the sinner. But criticism and condemnation must be well-informed, and our source of information, so far as principles are concerned, is, not the secularist Press which has no sound belief and no standard of morality, but the teaching Church. In the chaos of political and economic theory in which the hapless world is involved, the one clear

and steady guiding light comes from Rome, and is or should be reflected in the mind of every Catholic worthy of the name. And, with those laws of moral conduct which have raised man from the brute and created all that is sound in our civilization, questioned or denied, and widely disregarded in practice, what is to redeem the world from corruption but the unbending ethical code which the Catholic Church has never ceased to proclaim? God forbid that the salt should ever lose its savor, that Christians should discard the insignia of Christ. Here, then, is matter for each one's consideration. Can I be recognized as a Catholic by my knowledge of Catholic teaching, ethical and social, and by my zeal to apply it for the benefit of my neighbor? There are plenty of philanthropists about: industrial welfare and international peace are the concern of multitudes of earnest workers; do the qualities of my service—its patience and energy, its perseverance and universality—point to a supernatural origin? Let us, in our exercise of the charity that marks us off from the unenlightened and the unregenerate, by no means neglect the corporal works of mercy, but let us remember that the practice of the spiritual works—the instructing of the ignorant, the counseling of the doubtful—may well be, in our time, a more necessary and acceptable proof of our genuine Catholicity.

Lingard

CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS

Reprinted from the Historical Bulletin (*St. Louis*), *March, 1933.*

I

AFTER the Rebellion of '45, the English Catholics were reduced to an insignificant fraction of the population. It was almost exactly a hundred years after this rebellion that Newman was received into the Church and that the Irish emigrants from the famine of 1846 began to flock in numbers into England. But for a century the English Catholics were negligible. Yet, during this century, perhaps in spite of, perhaps because of, that smallness of numbers, the legal disabilities from which Catholics suffered were removed in the three Acts of 1778, 1791 and 1829. It was during this

same period that the struggling Catholic minority gave to the world many heroic and devoted sons, a few of whom became men of mark and note, such as Milner and Butler. Above all this minority produced one whom I think it is no insult to any other to describe as the greatest man born of English Catholic parents since the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

On the 5th of February, 1771—two years after Napoleon and the Duke of Wellington—John Lingard was born at Winchester, the son of a poor carpenter. He early gave promise of remarkable abilities and attracted the notice of Mr. Nolan, the priest at Winchester. Through Nolan's influence a burse was obtained for him at the English College at Douai, and at the age of nine he left an England still seething with the aftermath of the Gordon Riots in order to receive a Catholic education in France, at that time engaged in the War of American Independence against England.

He decided to stay on at Douai after his schooldays in order to study for the priesthood. He expected to be ordained there, but before the time for his ordination came the troubles of the French Revolution had driven him and his college back to England. He returned in 1793 and was ordained priest, one of the first to be ordained in England since the Reformation.

The French Revolution overturned everything, and there was nobody whose life was more completely altered by it than the English Catholics. Up till then France had been their country of refuge, England their persecutor. Now it was France that drove them out, and England, which had offered a generous welcome to exiled French Catholics, felt that she could not be less generous to Catholics of her own blood. On June 24, 1791, the Second Catholic Relief Act, according to which it was no longer a penal offence to say Mass publicly, was passed on the two hundred and thirty-second anniversary of the Penal Act of Elizabeth by which the saying of Mass was forbidden.

What should be the policy of Catholics in face of these new circumstances and this new opportunity? That was the question to which every Catholic of intelligence could not but see that a well-considered answer was necessary. There was no one who from the accident of his age, his experience and his intellectual ability was more clearly marked

out to give an answer to that question than John Lingard, and it is in his answer that his importance in English history lies.

The external details of his life can be soon told and soon dismissed. He went first to teach at Crook Hall, near Durham, where he remained until the transference of the College to Ushaw in 1808. In 1811 he became the parish priest at the little village of Hornby in Lancashire and remained so until his death in 1851. The importance of this man was in his mind.

Lingard had plenty of opportunity for obtaining high positions. He could certainly have been Bishop; he could almost certainly have been a Cardinal, but rightly or wrongly he thought that he was not fitted for an executive post. He thought that his gifts were those of an adviser, and he was quite careless, as was but to be expected of so great a man, whether he or another received the credit of the policy which he advised. It is only as we read through his letters and the testimony of his contemporaries that we gain an impression of the immensity of his influence. After his establishment at Hornby and the publication of his history, he acquired a position in English life unlike that which any parish priest has ever held before or since. Not only did Cardinals and Catholic Bishops turn to him for advice in every difficulty. The Protestant Bishop of Chester sent to him his charge before he distributed it to his own clergy. A Unitarian minister made of him his confidant. Brougham, later to be Whig Lord Chancellor, and Pollock, to be Tory Attorney-General, went out of their way in days when traveling was not the easy business that it is today to pay a visit to Hornby and to take the advice of the corpenters' son, who was parish-priest there. What then was the policy which Lingard urged on his fellow Catholics?

On the one hand, he said, Catholicism must without flinching accept the challenge of research. She has nothing to fear from the acceptance of such a challenge; she has everything to fear from the refusal of it. In the study of history, in particular, we must not shrink from the appeal to the original documents. On the contrary we must demand it. The influence of the French Revolution was spreading to England, and the demand grew loud: "Let us no longer be content ot accept the past on hearsay." They did not

doubt for an instant that the verdict of scientific history would be one of complete condemnation of Catholic claims. It was Lingard's supreme and sovereign merit that he turned their own guns on the enemies of the Church. He showed that, on the contrary, it was the Whigs and the Voltaireans who copied one another and made up the history that pleased them, and that the better the past was understood the stronger the Catholic case was seen to be. You will not today hear the sweeping generalizations of condemnation of the Middle Ages which were common a hundred years ago; the credit is due, more than to any other, to Lingard. A year before his death he wrote in a private letter to his friend Walker of Scarborough: "You must know that I have long had the notion—a very presumptuous one, probably—that the revolution in the Protestant mind as to the doctrines of Popery was owing to my history. Young and inquisitive minds in the Universities were induced to examine my authorities contradicting their favorite religious opinions; and finding me correct, began to doubt of their previout convictions and so forth. This is very presumptuous in me, still I have little doubt of my having been the original cause of the new feeling created in the Universities on that head."

He was right. Only one who has never read the incredible rigmarole that was printed in the text-books of the early years of the last century can doubt at all how right he was. But that end was only achieved by a very deliberate policy. He was under no kind of illusion about the intense suspicion of Catholicism which inhabited the breast of the Victorian Englishman. The anti-Catholic historians must not therefore be attacked by name. Vulgar errors about Catholicism must not be exposed with ridicule. The truth must be coldly set down, the original authorities for it must be given and it must then be left to do its own work. In particular in such an atmosphere the Catholic can never afford to be wrong. It is not enough to be generally accurate. If he is once proved wrong, it will be sufficient in the temper of the times to get him a reputation for general carelessness. He must win every controversy. If he is not quite certain of victory he must not enter into controversy, even though abstention means the abandonment of some cause which he believes defensible. "Through the

work," he writes in a private letter, "I made it a rule to tell the truth, whether it made for us or against; to avoid all appearance of controversy that I might not repel Protestant readers; and yet to furnish every necessary proof in our favour in the notes; so that if you compare my narrative to Hume's, for example, you will find that with the aid of notes, it is a complete refutation of him without appearing to be so. This I thought preferable. In my account of the Reformation I must say much to shock Protestant prejudices and my only chance of being read by them depends upon my having the reputation of a temperate writer. The good to be done is by writing a book which Protestants will read." He would not carry his history up to the Revolution of 1688, although he was as completely master of that period as of any other. The Glorious Revolution was still looked upon by Englishmen of every party with almost religious reverence. Even so true a Tory as Sir Walter Scott, it will be remembered, would not deny that it was for the better. Lingard, as his letters show, saw it clearly for the cads' ramp that it was, but the time for exposing it, he thought, had not yet come. If he attacked the Glorious Revolution, the only effect would be to make people think of him as a crank. and thus to weaken his exposure of the Reformation. Other writers would come who could do for the seventeenth what he had done for the sixteenth century.

These were the rules which he laid down for himself. Only one who has read his private correspondence, brimful as it is with contempt for vulgar and facile inaccuracy, who has seen him making lists of the errors of Macaulay and Carlyle and then docketing them away in his desk with the reflection that it is better to leave non-Catholics to expose the errors of non-Catholics, that publication would do more harm than good—only such a one can appreciate what was the strength of the discipline to which Lingard submitted himself. Those letters prove him to have possessed a mastery of the withering sarcasm such as had not been seen in letters since Voltaire. He denied himself the use of his greatest literary gift because he thought the use of it would harm the cause of Catholicism. Only once, I fancy, did he allow himself to use this power of sarcasm in his published works. It is in his "Anglo-Saxon Church."

"The sagacity of Mosheim," he writes, "has discovered that this practise [that of celibacy] owned its origin not to the doctrine of the gospel but to the influence of the climate." There follow two lines of learned references and then the delightful comment: "If this be true we must admire the heroism of its present inhabitants, who in their harems have subdued the influence of the climate and introduced the difficult practise of polygamy in lieu of the easy virtue of chastity." But this is the only instance of his indulgence.

On the other hand, if we consider the date at which he wrote, it is extraordinary how high was the level of accuracy which he maintained. Page after page of Macaulay is disfigured by the grossest errors both in text and reference. Froude gives as quotations sentences which are but paraphrases, if that, of their original. And their modern defenders plead that the age was not an age of accurate history. Lingard, working under enormously greater difficulties than Macaulay or Froude, covering an enormously larger period than they, can hardly be convicted of a single inaccuracy. Even where new evidence has come to light since his time, very often, as in the case of Chapuys' reports of the state of England to Charles V, it is entirely confirmed conclusions to which Lingard had already come. The importance in the history of reviving Catholicism of the Providential accident that the first and greatest of all English scientific historians should have been a Catholic priest can hardly be exaggerated as Cardinal Wiseman said at the time of his death. "It is a Providence that in history we have given to the nation a writer like Lingard whose gigantic merit will be better appreciated in each successive generation as it sees his work standing calm and erect amidst the shoals of petty pretenders to usurp his station . . . This is a mercy, indeed, and rightful honour to him who, at such a period of time, worked his way not into a high rank but to the very loftiest point of literary position."

Lingard was one of the last of that old, leisured generation, in which a man of reading and ability could acquire to himself almost the whole of learning, as learning then was. The classics were at his finger tips. French was as much his language as English. All history was his. He was a versifier of talent. Witness this translation of Malherbe's beautiful lines:

She was of earth where oft the fairest flower
Meets with the saddest lot.
Rose fared as roses fare—through one short hour
She bloomed and then was not.

As a critic of architecture, he used unceasingly an argument that is today in favor, maintaining that a century that would live must have its own architecture, not subsist on a revival of the past, and with such an argument waged fierce war with his great fellow-Catholic contemporary, Pugin.

But, though a man of the mind, and though as he himself thought unfitted for executive posts, he was anything but the remote pedant, who knows nothing of the forces by which the world is swayed and who is indifferent to the problems of the passing day. The victories of scholarship had their important part to play in the revival of English Catholicism, but Catholicism, he well knew, was not going to triumph by scholarship alone.

II

In Lingard's time there were Catholics, both among Old Catholics and among converts, who were subconsciously infected with admiration for the non-Catholic values of English life. There were others who were unnecessarily provocative in their outcry against those values. Lingard's was the middle way between these two extremes. He was far too much of a citizen of Europe to be taken in by the provincial prestige of Oxford and Cambridge. He had kindness and admiration for the leaders of the Oxford Movement. He was, as his letters show, quietly amused at what he considered the academic pride of some of the Oxford converts. Young men in a frenzy, old men in a panic—both alike raised in him only a good-natured smile. "I like your story of Newman in the Dormitory," he wrote to Walker, after Newman had paid his first visit to Ushaw. The story and the letter that contained it have unfortunately perished.

"There are many little things," he wrote, "in the writings of these new Catholics which appear rather novel to Catholics of the old school. Though they seem to know everything, there is much ignorance among them on many subjects connected with religion in former days. They carry with them to the task all the misrepresentation which they

had collected while they were Protestants. Their boasted proficiency is confined to one single branch of Greek learning (the play-wrights) and a useless branch too . . . As Latin scholars many of them are beneath contempt." Learning is a relative term and perhaps Lingard should have remembered that his learning was by no means that of the average English Old Catholic.

The prestige of the learning of the ancient Universities then stood high. Lingard's conviction was that that prestige was greatly exaggerated. If a fellow of an Oxford college became a Catholic, why then, God in His mercy had rescued a soul from invincible ignorance and there was cause for rejoicing; but Lingard was opposed to the making of an extraordinary fuss about him just because he had been a Don. On the contrary, he argued he could well understand an active unreflecting man accepting the code of values which reigned in English Church and State. What was truly stupid was still to hold that code after reflection—to imagine for a moment that what was so patently gaping with inconsistencies was really capable of defence by scholarship or philosophy. The so-called academic Englishman was, he thought, the stupidest sort of Englishmen. Even to have been captured by the values of Oxford for a time was an evidence of weakness.

His policy was then to say once and for all why the claims of Protestantism were inacceptable—he did say it in an article, "Did the Anglican Church Reform Herself?" in one of the numbers of the *Dublin Review* of 1840—and then to leave the matter. He was utterly contemptuous of any kind of theological compromise with Protestantism. "The miserable sophistry," he called it, "by which it is sought to humbug the people and persuade them that the present is in truth the old Church of England." "Do speak with sovereign contempt of it," he wrote to his friend, Walker of Scarborough. Yet at the same time he thought himself under a positive obligation to use his high social gifts in order to establish as many personal friendships as possible with individual Protestants. The larger the part that Catholics could play in English life without in any way compromising their principles the better. A part played at the expense of compromise or even of the suspicion of compromise would be disastrous; but with Lingard, though fools

cried out against him, there could be no sane suspicion of compromise. And when he died, his policy in that respect received a tribute which, it is said, has never been paid to any other Catholic priest since the Reformation. His Protestant neighbors subscribed to erect a tablet to his memory in the Protestant Church at Hornby.

The Protestant world must be confronted with the full and uncompromising statement of Catholic truth. But it must be treated with discretion. It must not be frightened off by the offering to it of non-essentials as essentials. For that reason he was opposed to the introduction into England of what are known as *les petites dévotions*—of customs which were edifying and laudable where in Catholic countries they were the spontaneous growths of the devotional habits of the people, but which were only laudable because they were spontaneous and which were in no way enjoined in the deposit of faith which Christ gave to His Apostles. Perhaps his fear of the scandal of these devotions was exaggerated. He objected too, it is amusing to note, to the wearing of the Roman collar. Certainly times have changed since his day, and experience seems to have proved that the English are more ready to accept the devotions and the customs of the Faith than its essential reason.

Yet the making of converts was only the secondary business of the Church. Her primary business was with the organization of the life of those who already accepted her. And here again his whole battle was for liberty in non-essentials. He was a scholar who thought that more harm than good would come from the unscholarly, slap-dash methods of Milner. He was a secular priest and he fought the battle of his kind against the regulars, Jesuit and others —the battle for Ushaw and the battle for the secular control of the English college at Rome. By selecting isolated, unconsidered sentences from his private letters one could make it appear that he was an enemy of the regular clergy, but other extracts could easily be produced in refutation of such a conclusion. It is true that in the early years before emancipation he was doubtful of the wisdom of having the Jesuits in England, not through enmity to the Jesuits, but simply through fear that the traditional hostility to them would prevent the granting of emancipation. In his broad view non-essentials were not a matter of right or

wrong. "In my Father's House are many mansions." And in all things which the Church permitted, but did not command, it was essential that variety should be preserved. The secular clergy and every order among the regular clergy—each had its especial work to do. It was essential that no one should be allowed to oust the other. He did not desire that his beloved Ushaw should in any way flourish to the exclusion of other Catholic schools. He merely desired that it should flourish. It was, he argued, of positive value that there should be different Catholic schools with different policies on non-essentials, so that the parent who was attracted by one little custom, the parent who was repelled by another—each should have a school to which he could send his son. There were different sorts of Catholics and there should be different sorts of schools to which to send them.

That was the sum of his teaching—that the Catholic claim of its very nature implied that the same beliefs were offered to every variety of man. Catholicism was not a creed merely for country-gentlemen, nor merely for Irish immigrants, for literary folk or for unliterary folk, for Liberals or for Conservatives. It was of the very essence of its appeal that it offered its consolations to every type of soul and that it asked of every type not that he become somebody else but rather that he become more truly himself. With its small numbers there was a danger that the Church in England would be captured by some particular school of thought, some particular political party, some particular system of education. Against that danger Catholics must always be on the watch. Catholicism must never be allowed to become less than Catholic.

Of Lingard's private life many anecdotes and much gossip survive. His great friends at Hornby were the family of Squire Murray, and all the printed biographies speak of his delight in the company of the Murray children. It is the fashion of the day to pretend that men of the highest intellect should be willing to spend their whole lives in the company of children. But I am bound to say that Mrs. Lomax's unpublished recollections of Lingard give a slightly different picture of the Lewis Carol side of his life than that which has hitherto found its way into print. "To the young Murrays, then children at Hornby Hall," writes Mrs. Lomax, "he was very gracious—for a quarter of an hour."

The truth was, that, in spite of the sentimentalities, he was a man whose business and whose pleasure both lay mainly in the company of men. In an age of good living he loved good living, taking every night "a pint of champagne" with his dinner, and in an age of hospitality he loved to dispense such hospitality as he could afford, "having and giving the best of everything on the smallest scale," writes Mrs. Lomax. He was a full man, and it was characteristic of him that his respect for asceticism was only equalled by his contempt for insensitiveness to the pleasures of the table. Through asceticism man raised himself above the animals; through insensitiveness he sank back again to their level. To deny oneself the good things of life was noble but not to know which of the things of life were good was merely bestial. . . .

Such trivialities are important only as showing the impatience of this great man with those whose own values were trivial. For dominating his whole life was an overpowering sense of the greatness and the love of God,—of the great truths to which learning and reason had brought him. In spite of temptation to do so he refused to accept the conclusion of despair that his countrymen were incapable of reason. With patience, he argued, prejudice and sentimentality can be dissipated. It is too early yet to say whether he was right, or whether, as sometimes appears probable, his was a losing fight. He himself was certainly under no illusion about its difficulty. Prophecy is dangerous, but we may say with fair certainty that by our grandchildren's time one of two things will have happened. Either all knowledge of letters will have perished from England or else Lingard's will be recognized as one of the foremost intellects of the nineteenth century. If any honor for learning is to survive at all his place is secure upon the topmost pinnacles of fame.

Catholic Evidence

Can Anglicanism Unite With Rome? — W. H. McClellan, S.J. 5c.

Why I Am A Catholic — J. H. Fasy, S.J.—5c.

What Catholics Do Not Believe—T. J. McGrath, S.J.—5c.

The New Morality and the National Lite—Jones I. Corrigan, S.J.—5c.

Christ and Mankind—M. J. Scott, S.J.—5c.

What Is a Catholic Attitude? — F. P. LeBuffe, S.J.—5c.

Why Apologize? — W. I. Lonergan, S.J.—5c.

What, Then, Must I Believe? 1. God, the Cosmos, Man—W. I. Lonergan, S.J.—5c.

The Modern Indictment of Catholicism — W. I. Lonergan, S.J. — *Five Pamphlets:*

I. IS THE CHURCH INTOLERANT?—5c.
II. IS THE CHURCH ARROGANT?—5c.
III. IS THE CHURCH UN-AMERICAN?—5c.
IV. IS THE CHURCH OFFICIOUS?—5c.
V. IS THE CHURCH A NATIONAL ASSET?—5c.

Chaplaincy, Newman Club or Catholic College — W. Parsons, S.J.—5c.

Encyclical on Reconstruction — Pope Pius XI—5c.

Encyclical on Labor—Pope Leo XIII—5c.

Can the Churches Unite?—W. I Lonergan, S.J.—5c.

Do Miracles Happen?—W. I. Lonergan, S.J.—5c.

Did Man Make Religion? — W. I. Lonergan, S.J.—5c.

The Church and Tolerance — M. Riquet, S.J.—5c.

Encyclical on Education—5c.

Encyclical on Marriage—5c.

Encyclical on Retreats—5c.

The Liturgical Movement: in and for America—G. Ellard, S.J.—5c.

Four Great Converts—J. LaFarge, S.J.—5c.

The Catholic Doctrine of Matrimony—F. J. Connell, C.SS.R., S.T.D.—10c.

God and Caesar—J. Husslein, S.J. —10c.

The Church and the State — W. Parsons, S.J.—10c.

Stumbling Blocks to Catholicism—W. I. Lonergan, S.J. — *Five Pamphlets:*

I. A MAN WHO IS GOD—5c.
II. THE CONFESSIONAL BOGEY!—5c.
III. THE "WORSHIP" OF MARY—5c.
IV. THE "MYTH" OF HELL—5c.
V. THE SHACKLES OF WEDLOCK—5c.

Christ True God — M. J. Scott, S.J.—5c.

Catholicism True as God — M. J. Scott, S.J.—5c.

Menace of Atheism—W. I. Lonergan, S.J.—25c.

Complete Sets $2.00 :: 10 Sets or more, $1.80 each

Postage on Each Set, 15 Cents Extra

THE AMERICA PRESS, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

October . . .

Litany of Our Lady—

The America Press offers the third little volume of Father LeBuffe's "Let Us Pray" Series, those inestimably beautiful paraphrases of popular prayers. The volume is on the "Litany of Our Lady," helping us to understand the meaning and deepen the appreciation of the beauty of the invocations.—*Franciscan Herald.*

30 cents (postage 3 cents) each
12 or more copies, 25 cents each
(postage extra)

Christ the King
God and Cæsar
The Blessed Virgin
JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.
St. Margaret Mary
J. C. REVILLE, S.J.
Church and State
WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

10 cents (postage 2 cents) each;
$7.00 per hundred

All Grace Through Mary
JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.
The "Worship" of Mary
WILLIAM I. LONERGAN, S.J.

5 cents (postage 2 cents) each;
$4.00 per hundred

☞ **Complete set (postage included)—$1.00**

THE AMERICA PRESS

461 Eighth Avenue New York, N. Y.